



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/758,911

01/10/2001

Luke Surazski

13522/43 (99688)

9288

757 7590 11/17/2008
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

WONG, BLANCHE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/758,911	Applicant(s) SURAZSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Blanche Wong	Art Unit 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38, 39, 45 and 56-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 34-36, 38, 39, 45 and 56-61 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 August 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,10,12-16,23,34-36,38,39,45,56-61 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant argues that the references does not provide support for the amendment "interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called" and as support, points to Specification, p.17, lines 15-16, "an interactive communication mechanism without causing any unnecessary ringing of "phones".

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 23,45,56-61 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With regard to claim 23, Examiner suggests replacing "the party" in line 18 with "the party to be called" in consistent with claim language.

With regard to claim 45, Examiner suggests replacing "the party" in line 16 with "the party to be called" in consistent with claim language.

With regard to claim 45,56-61, Examiner suggests replacing "computer readable medium" with "computer readable media" as Specification discloses.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1,10,13,14**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lund (U.S. Pat No. 6,658,100) in view of Myers et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,868,140) and Grady et al. (U.S. Pat No. 5,712,906).

With regard to claim 1, Lund discloses

requesting information about a party to be called from a protocol server (**“a call is placed to the called party CPE”, col. 3, line 22**);

receiving a Universal Resource Locator (URL) in response to the request (**“the originating CPE 106 receives the URL”, col. 3, line 46**) from the protocol server (database 44) (**“querying a database 44 to retrieve the called party's URL”, col. 3, lines 23-24**) (**See Also Internet server database 52, col. 3, line 49**); and displaying to the caller one option includes accessing a first web page at the URL (**“displaying the web page corresponding to that URL to the originating CPE 106”, col. 3, lines 27-28**).

However, Lund fails to explicitly show interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called, and wherein the first web page includes the one or more connections options.

In a person placing a call, Myers discloses interacting through a first web page with a second web page (**hierarchical menus, col. 7, line 11**). In a subscriber device, Grady discloses one or more connections options (**a menu of connection options, col. 14, line 5**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include interacting through a first web page with a second web page as taught in Myers and one or more connections options as taught in Grady with Lund in order to provide for more possibilities using nested web pages and choices of connections

With regard to claim 10, Lund further discloses access the first web page through the protocol server (**database 44**) ("**querying a database 44 to retrieve the called party's URL**", col. 3, lines 23-24) (*See Also Internet server database 52, col. 3, line 49*).

With regard to claim 13, Lund further discloses the one or more connection options are also modified based on an identity of the caller ("**based on the number dialed**", col. 3, line 24).

With regard to claim 14, Lund further discloses the one or more connection options correspond to a phone number of the party to be called **based on the number dialed", col. 3, line 24)**.

6. **Claim 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lund, Myers, and Grady as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nuutinen (U.S. Pat No. 6865681).

With regard to claim 12, the combination of Lund, Myers, and Grady discloses the method of claim 1. However, the combination fails to explicitly show one or more options are encoded using Session Initiation Protocol.

Nuutinen discloses one or more options are encoded using Session Initiation Protocol **(a secured VoIP implemented with SIP, col. 2, line 17)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include one or more options are encoded using Session Initiation Protocol as taught in Nuutinen with Lund, Myers, and Nuutinen in order to provide for a security VoIP.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. **Claims 23,34-36,38,39,45,56-61** are allowed.

Art Unit: 2419

8. Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With regard to claims 23 and 45, the prior art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious a device and a computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions that can "... receive a second request issued to the Universal Resource Locator; determine a location of the party to be called from a presence server; modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party to be called; generate a web page, wherein the web page includes the one or more connection options; and return the web page in response to the second request."

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Min (US 2004/0145604) discloses a service method and system between two mobile terminals, and displaying information stored in the first mobile terminal on a screen of a second mobile terminal. However, the effective date of Min does not qualify Min as prior art.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blanche Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 2419

3177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830am to 530pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Blanche Wong/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419
November 9, 2008

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419